IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.104 OF 2006

IN

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO.222 OF 1999

Kalyan Dombivli Municipal Corpn. ...Applicant

Versus

Shri.Prakash Mutha ...Respondent

.....

Mr.Deepak Pandey i/b Mr.A.S.Rao for Applicant.

Mr.Pethe i/b Mr.R.G.Ketkar for Respondent.

.....

CORAM: A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.

MARCH 7, 2007.

P.C.

1. Counsel for the Respondent submits that he is not able to contact the Respondent. Request is made to issue notice directly to the Respondent as the Revision Application is already disposed of.

2. The request will have to be turned down for two reasons. In the first place, the Vakalatnama of Mr.Ketkar for Respondent continues

to be on record in relation to Civil Revision Application No.222 of 1999 in which present Application has been filed. For that reason, Mr.Ketkar will be responsible to appear for the Respondent even in this Civil Application. Secondly, Office noting indicates that Respondent has been served. No reply has been filed to controvert the assertion in the Application. The explanation offered in the Application being sufficient cause, Application is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a) and (b).

A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.